

CORRECTING THE 'CORRECTION' OF WARMIST FINKEL

Andrew Bolt, Herald Sun, December 9, 2018 8:52am

Subscriber only

Alan Finkel is our Chief Scientist, so his "correction" should not be so blatantly misleading:

The opinion piece by Andrew Bolt ("Uncouth youth protest their flawed arguments"...) included a reference to me "admitting" that we "could stop all Australia's emissions – junk every car, shut every power station, put a cork in every cow – and the effect on the climate would still be 'virtually nothing'."

Those are Andrew Bolt's words, not mine, and they are a complete misrepresentation of my position.

Really? Here is the actual exchange I was quoting from, where Senator Ian Macdonald asked what would happen if Australia ended all its man-made emissions - 1.3 per cent of the world's total:

So far, so correct. Finkel indeed said what I said he said.

So why does he say my words "misrepresented" him?

They suggest we should do nothing to reduce our carbon emissions, a stance I reject, and I wish to correct the record.

Actually, nowhere have I said or suggested that this was Finkel's stance, even though it clearly should be. It is my stance. So there is nothing in my article to "correct".

Finkel continues:

My response was the impact would be virtually nothing but I immediately continued by explaining that doing nothing is not a position that we can responsibly take because emissions reductions is a little bit like voting, in that if everyone took the attitude that their vote does not count and no-one voted, we would not have a democracy.

Similarly, if all countries that have comparable carbon emissions took the position that they shouldn't take action because their contribution to this global problem is insignificant, then nobody would act and the problem would continue to grow in scale.

What tosh.

For a start, the analogy is false.

In an election, for instance, any one vote could change the outcome in a seat. A vote can make a decisive difference. And the total effect makes a profound one - it decides the government.

Not so with cutting emissions.

Even if every single country cut emissions in line with the Paris Agreement, the difference to the climate would still be virtually nothing.

Dr Bjorn Lomborg has calculated that "If we measure the impact of every nation fulfilling every promise by 2030, the total temperature reduction will be 0.048°C (0.086°F) by 2100."

That is miniscule, and even then could be exaggerated: it presumes that temperatures are indeed as sensitive to carbon dioxide emissions as once thought, when there's actually growing evidence that it isn't.

Finkel also implies that if Australia does not act then other nations - China, say, or France will not.

The idea that China decides its energy policy on what Australia does is a fantasy. its Communist Party does precisely what it thinks is in China's interest. And the France - where the government has given in to riots against the global warming tax - shows us that domestic considerations trump international ones even there.

And speaking of trump...

But what "problem" does Finkel actually see? Warming has virtually stopped so far this century, and the warming we've seen so far (some of it man made) has not resulted in the predicted catastrophes. We've had fewer cyclones, no increase in drought, and record crops this past decade. Three times more low-lying atoll islands are growing than are shrinking.

But Finkel continues:

In response to the recent IPCC report, I urged all decision makers – in government, industry, and the community – to listen to the science and focus on the goal of reducing emissions, while maximising economic growth.

Finkel is wrong to claim that reducing emissions is compatible with "maximising economic growth".

He concludes:

Sitting on our hands while expecting the rest of the world to do their part is simply not acceptable.

Not to him, maybe.

But doing something completely useless and damaging in the naive expectation that the rest of the world will be inspired to do things equally useless and damaging is not acceptable to me.